FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700245

A. List of Restoration Activities

The project area is the entire 3.6 million acres of the 67 wilderness areas in the CDD. These areas were closed to OHV use upon designation in 1994. However, 1,400 trails and ways crossed the 4,000 miles of wilderness boundary. These encouraged illegal egress by desert OHV users. The BLM has employed at least six management tools: Boundary signing, preparation and distribution of current of maps, education and outreach, 'hard barrier' [e.g., fences, barricades], a law enforcement presence, and 'soft barrier' [vertical mulch] construction.

Much progress has been made. However, those past efforts need to be continued and maintained. Also, segments of wilderness boundaries where restoration using 'soft barriers' alone is insufficient must continue to be identified so that BLM can focus and employ a wider range of management tools. Also, please see 'how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation'.

The tasks will include:

• Review 7 years of monitoring data for 1,400 sites treated between 2000 and 2007;

• As necessary, supplement by field monitoring of 280 [20 % of 1,400 total] sites along wilderness boundaries;

• Maintain [i.e., reinstall] boundary signage along 400 miles [10% of the 4,000 miles total] of wilderness boundaries;

• Re-treat 80 degraded sites that were treated once or more between 2000 and 2007;

• Install 7 miles of light fence along regions of heavy incursions where vertical mulching is necessary, but not sufficient.

• Distribution of maps and brochures to desert users in the field by monitoring and restoration staff.

In 1995, approximately 2,500 wilderness boundary signs were installed. There is an on-going maintenance workload associated with this signing. Through the years, improved signing strategies have been developed.

Over five years, from 2000 through 2005, 'pit and mulch' and other restoration treatments were performed on those sites along the wilderness boundaries. Restoration treatments have been and will be maintained on the way or trail leading into the wilderness from the wilderness boundary to the line-of-sight from the boundary. The 'pit and mulch' technique consists of creating an eight inch diameter inverted hemisphere and placing dead vegetation and other materials [vertical mulching] on the ground surface. The pits increase water percolation and collection and serve as traps for windblown native seed. The vertical mulching provides shade and so decreases the ground temperature, which decreases the mortality of emerging new vegetation. This restoration technique also produced 'visual barriers' which camouflage the trails leading into wilderness.

Approximately 130 gates, fences and other hard barriers have been installed along wilderness boundaries. These may require some maintenance or replacement. In addition, there is additional fencing needed. These would be light fences which, particularly along boundary roads that are heavily used by OHV recreationists, delineate wilderness boundaries more conspicuously and continuously than boundary signs.

The Otay Mountain Wilderness was designated in 1999. There are wilderness Study areas, some of which have route designation completed. These are currently outside of the scope of the proposed project for all management tasks other than monitoring of OHV incursions. Monitoring those area boundaries are within the scope of the proposed project.

B. How the Proposed Project Relates to OHV Recreation

The project area is the entire 3.6 million acres of the 67 wilderness areas in the CDD. These areas were closed to OHV use upon designation in 1994. However, 1,400 trails and ways crossed the 4,000 miles of wilderness boundary. The management tools immediately utilized by BLM included boundary sign installation, readily available maps of the wilderness areas, and outreach and education efforts with users. These were successful with a considerable percentage of desert users. However, illegal egress by desert OHV users remained as a management issue. So in areas of intensive vehicle use in wilderness, the BLM focused their law enforcement presence, constructed gates fences and barriers, and in 2000 initiated the construction of 'soft barriers' [i.e., vertical mulching and pitting].

This management has reduced incursions into wilderness by the vast majority of desert users. Most use the desert responsibly and appropriate use is in wilderness areas is now more obvious. However, illegal the vehicle use remains in portions of the desert.

Such use constitutes to cause resource damage, such as habitat fragmentation, and leads to criticism of the entire OHV community due to the actions of a few. The project has been discussed with the CDD Desert Advisory Council and The Desert Managers Group.

This project would continue to support the OHV community in their responsible use of the desert, by maintaining and supplementing a user sense of appropriate use in wilderness and better delineating the location of wilderness boundaries. The proposed project would also maintain and continue the considerable investments of OHV grant and federal funding to produce visual barriers, boundary signing, and enhance visitor awareness through education and outreach to the users.

C. Size of Project Site

The scope of the project is the entire 4,000 miles of wilderness boundary in the CDD. This would maintain and continue to reduce degradation of 3.6 million acres in 71 wilderness areas. These include, for example, the Black Mountain and North Algadones, Bigelow Cholla Garden ACEC's.

While riparian areas are rare in the project area, portions of Mission Creek and the Amargosa and their associated wetlands are partially in the project area. However, no restoration treatments would be performed in these riparian areas or wetlands. Rather, treatments would be adjoined to them to protect their values.

The project area provides habitat for 15 listed species, including desert tortoise, peninsular bighorn sheep, and Least Bill's Vireo. In addition, dominant special status species include desert bighorn sheep, Mohave Ground Squirrel, and the Inyo Mountain Salamander.

The major on-site treatment of 80 sites from the wilderness boundary to the visual horizon encompasses approximately 5 miles or 5 acres of treatment. However, the combination of management tools [i.e., signing and ‘visual’ and ‘hard’ barriers] specificd in the proposed project supplement and make more effective educational and law enforcement efforts for use on the entire 3.6 million acres.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

The purpose of the proposed project is to reduce OHV incursions into wilderness. The degree to which this is successful is determined by recurring monitoring of wilderness boundaries and, specifically, previously treated sites. The geospatial data collected includes the location and the nature and extent of OHV use both prior to treatment or re-treatment. The data has been collected using a variety of hardware, and software over the years. Currently, the data is collected using Trimble GPS units with a data dictionary that includes those types of data. The data is collected via recurring monitoring as well as prior and subsequent to any treatments [e.g., barrier construction]. Photos are also taken at certain stages of monitoring or site treatments. As such, the geo-data base contains data for the nature and extent of all treatments [e.g., signing and ‘visual’ and ‘hard’ barriers] that have been applied over time. This is stored in a CDD Wilderness Restoration geo-data base.

Vertical mulching and pitting is not a live plant restoration technique. Rather it is a site preparation technique to increase the probability of and accelerate natural re-vegetation of the sites. There has been considerable success with this technique. However, it has failed on certain sites from a variety of causes, including wind and water erosion and trampling by the passage of OHVs [signing and ‘visual’ and ‘hard’ barriers] OHV use. Therefore, the data dictionary and photos document the extent, and in some cases, the causes of failure where identifiable in establishment of live vegetation.

E. List of Reports

N/A

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

N/A

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

Six management tools to manage OHV use along wilderness boundaries were listed in the project description. This proposed project includes four of these six. Preparation of current maps is not part of this project proposal, but distribution in the field by monitoring and restoration staff would be a component.

The major component that is not directly specified in this project proposal is a law enforcement presence. The Field Offices do have Law enforcement plans that include, based on need and availability of LER staff, presence along wilderness boundaries. So the Field Office law enforcement officers do protect the investments associated with the project area by reducing OHV incursions. The critical point is that the signing and 'hard and soft' barriers help them focus their efforts to be more efficient as well as increase the probability of successful prosecution of citations. Furthermore, the evidence of past OHV incursion [e.g., trampled restorations sites, ripped down fences] makes very obvious where a law enforcement presence is most warranted.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700245

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

Map of the California Desert District - BLM

CDD BLM Wilderness Map

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

clipper before

clipper after

Student Conservation Person

Old Woman Mts

	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # _____		
APPLICANT NAME :	BLM - California Desert District		
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration - Wilderness Restoration VIII	**PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :**	
PROJECT TYPE :	☐ Acquisition ☐ Development ☐ Education & Safety ☐ Ground Operations ☐ Law Enforcement ☐ Planning ☑ Restoration		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	The project area is the entire 3.6 million acres of the 67 wilderness areas in the CDD. These areas were closed to OHV use upon designation in 1994. However, 1,400 trails and ways crossed the 4,000 miles of wilderness boundary. These encouraged illegal egress by desert OHV users. The BLM has employed at least six management tools: Boundary signing, preparation and distribution of current of maps, education and outreach, 'hard barrier' [e.g., fences, barricades], a law enforcement presence, and 'soft barrier' [vertical mulch] construction. Much progress has been made. However, those past efforts need to be continued and maintained. Also, segments of wilderness boundaries where restoration using 'soft barriers' alone is insufficient must continue to be identified so that BLM can focus and employ a wider range of management tools. Also, please see 'how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation'. The tasks will include: • Review 7 years of monitoring data for 1,400 sites treated between 2000 and 2007; • As necessary, supplement by field monitoring of 280 [20 % of 1,400 total] sites along wilderness boundaries; • Maintain [i.e., reinstall] boundary signage along 400 miles [10% of the 4,000 miles total] of wilderness boundaries; • Re-treat 80 degraded sites that were treated once or more between 2000 and 2007; • Install 7 miles of light fence along regions of heavy incursions where vertical mulching is necessary, but not sufficient. • Distribution of maps and brochures to desert users in the field by monitoring and restoration staff. In 1995, approximately 2,500 wilderness boundary signs were installed. There is an on-going maintenance workload associated with this signing. Through the years, improved signing strategies have been developed. Over five years, from 2000 through 2005, 'pit and mulch' and other restoration treatments were performed on those sites along the wilderness boundaries. Restoration treatments have been and will be maintained on the way or trail leading into the wilderness from the wilderness boundary to the line-of-sight from the boundary. The 'pit and mulch' technique consists of creating an eight inch diameter inverted hemisphere and placing dead vegetation and other materials [vertical mulching] on the ground surface. The pits increase water percolation and collection and serve as traps for windblown native seed. The vertical mulching provides shade and so decreases the ground temperature, which decreases the mortality of emerging new vegetation. This restoration technique also produced 'visual barriers' which camouflage the trails leading into wilderness. Approximately 130 gates, fences and other hard barriers have been installed along wilderness boundaries. These may require some maintenance or replacement. In addition, there is additional fencing needed. These would be light fences which, particularly along boundary roads that are heavily used by OHV recreationists, delineate wilderness boundaries more conspicuously and continuously than boundary signs. The Otay Mountain Wilderness was designated in 1999. There are wilderness Study areas, some of which have route designation completed. These are currently outside of the scope of the proposed project for all management tasks other than monitoring of OHV incursions. Monitoring those area boundaries are within the scope of the proposed project.		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	**Staff**						
	Ecologist	80.000	50.000	HRS	2,000.00	2,000.00	4,000.00
	Archeologist	80.000	50.000	HRS	2,000.00	2,000.00	4,000.00
	Other-GIS DATA Specialist	140.000	80.000	HRS	5,600.00	5,600.00	11,200.00
	OHV Coordinator	40.000	50.000	HRS	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00
	Total for Staff				10,600.00	10,600.00	21,200.00
2	**Contracts**						
	Other-Monitoring, restoration, fence Cre	1.000	220000.000	EA	180,000.00	40,000.00	220,000.00
3	**Materials / Supplies**						
	Other-4- wire smooth fence	7.000	5000.000	MI	15,000.00	20,000.00	35,000.00
	Signs	800.000	25.000	EA	15,000.00	5,000.00	20,000.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				30,000.00	25,000.00	55,000.00
4	**Equipment Use Expenses**						
	4x4 Vehicle	3000.000	0.500	MI	0.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
5	**Equipment Purchases**						
	Other-GPS Units/software	2.000	6000.000	EA	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
6	**Others**						
7	**Administrative Costs**						
	Administrative Costs-Contract Administra	80.000	50.000	HRS	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00
Total Program Expenses					220,600.00	93,100.00	313,700.00

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					220,600.00	93,100.00	313,700.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					**220,600.00**	**93,100.00**	**313,700.00**

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	10,600.00	10,600.00	21,200.00	
2	Contracts	180,000.00	40,000.00	220,000.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	30,000.00	25,000.00	55,000.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	1,500.00	1,500.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Administrative Costs	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		220,600.00	93,100.00	313,700.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		220,600.00	93,100.00	313,700.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		**220,600.00**	**93,100.00**	**313,700.00**	

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700245

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ○ Yes ◉ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

b. ITEM 2 - Are the proposed activities a “Project” under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ○ Yes ◉ No
(Please select Yes or No)

c. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ◉ No

d. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a “Project” under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 3 – 9

All restoration activities associated with this project have been previously analyzed and provided for in previous grants as NEPA and CEQA adequate.

ITEM 3 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

ITEM 4 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

ITEM 5 - Soil Impacts

ITEM 6 - Damage to Scenic Resources

ITEM 7 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 8 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ○ Yes ○ No

If YES, describe the potential impacts and for any substantially adverse changes in the significance of historical or cultural resources and measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the impacts.

ITEM 9 - Indirect Significant Impacts

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Version # _____ APP # 700245

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ 76% or more (10 points)
- ○ 51% - 75% (5 points)
- ◉ 26% - 50% (3 points)
- ○ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 8

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
- ☑ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
- ☑ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
- ☑ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
- ☑ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [(see attached wilderness map)]
- ☑ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [desert tortoise, peninsular big horn sheep]
- ☑ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [fringed-toed lizard, desert big horn sheep, burrowing owls]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

The project will remove surface degredation of natural resources caused by unauthorized OHV travel.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
- ○ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
- ◉ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
- ○ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
- ○ Management decision (1 point)
- ○ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ○ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

California Desert Protection Act

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 8

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- [x] Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- [x] Use of native plants and materials
- [ ] Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- [x] Educational signage
- [ ] Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

Listed within the context of the grant proposal.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ No (No points)
- ◉ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

California Desert Protection Act 1994; CDCA Land Use Plan and Amendments

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ○ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ◉ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ○ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ○ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- [x] Meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
- [x] Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
- [ ] Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

Desert Managers Group, Desert Advisory Council, OHV Leadership Council (Qtrly meetings at CDD)

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ 4 or more (4 points)
- ○ 2 to 3 (2 points)
- ○ 1 (1 point)
- ○ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

OHV Leadership Council, Student Conservation Association, California Wilderness Coalition, Desert Survivors, The Wildlands Conservancy, Audubon Society, and Back Country Horsemen.

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will 1

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
- ☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
- ☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
- ☑ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

The BLM will utilize lessons learned from previous restoration activities associated with unauthorized OHV activity.

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ No (No points)
- ○ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ◉ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)
- ○ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ○ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ○ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)